

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-7 remain pending in the present application. Claim 1 has been amended. Basis for the amendments and new claims can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings originally filed.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1 and 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ueda, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,058,558). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 1 has been amended to define the inlet of the air conditioner as being located behind the radiator in the longitudinal direction of the vehicle. This allows for the simplification of the front end structure of the vehicle. In the present invention, since the axial flow fan rotates in a direction which deflects an air flow blown out of the fan (an air flowing through a radiator) to an intercooler side, even though an inlet of an air cleaner is located behind the radiator, air having a low temperature can be drawn into an engine.

Ueda, et al. discloses an inlet 26 that is located just in front of the radiator or substantially at the same position as that of an air flow opening of the radiator. Ueda, et al. is thus able to draw in cool engine air. The positioning of the inlet at the radiator complicates the front end structure of the vehicle. As described above, the present invention allows cool air to enter the inlet while simplifying the front end structure of the vehicle.

Thus, Applicants believe Claim 1, as amended, patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Likewise, Claims 4-7, which ultimately depend from Claim 1, are also

believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

#### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ueda, et al., as disclosed above in reference to Claims 1 and 4-7. Claims 2 and 3 ultimately depend from Claim 1. As detailed above, Claim 1 has been amended and is now believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Thus, Applicants believe Claims 2 and 3 also patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

#### **CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 9, 2005

By: 

Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg